

Application No. 10/643,516  
Amendment Dated 02/12/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 08/10/2006  
Page 6 of 11

### ***REMARKS***

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Claims 1-11 are rejected in the Office Action. Claim 1 is amended herein. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-11 is respectfully requested.

### ***Specification***

1. Applicant has reviewed and spell-checked the specification in an effort to correct minor errors as requested in the Office action, however, no such errors were identified.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102***

2. Paragraph 2 in the Office action includes a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) that forms the basis for the rejections in the Office action. No response is required from Applicant.
3. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected in the Office action under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lew et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0210472 (hereinafter Lew). Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 and 5 is respectfully requested.
4. Claim 1 has been amended herein to recite “tokenizing said questionnaire for reducing bandwidth requirements.” Support for this amendment can be found in the Specification, p. 11 which reads:

[0031] In another aspect of the present invention, the program and user responses are coded in such a fashion as to substantially reduce the bandwidth requirements of the network connection. Since many of the networking options for handheld devices provide limited bandwidth, best use may be made of the available throughput by coding, or tokenizing, program information and responses.

Application No. 10/643,516  
Amendment Dated 02/12/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 08/10/2006  
Page 7 of 11

As stated therein, the purpose of the tokenizing step in the disclosure is to reduce the bandwidth requirements that are available with the use of handheld devices. Thus transmission speed is increased.

The Lew reference, in contrast, as asserted in the Office action, p. 3, teaches tokenizing for the purpose of encrypting survey information, paragraph 0013, "to protect it from tampering by third parties." The Lew reference does not teach tokenizing for the purpose of reducing bandwidth requirements as is recited in Applicant's disclosure and claim 1, as amended herein. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is overcome. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

5. Applicant reincorporates his remarks contained in paragraph 4 above relating to claim 1. Since claim 5 depends from claim 1, claim 5 is allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 5 is respectfully requested.

6. Claim 7 is rejected in the Office action under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sendowski et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0198934 (hereinafter Sendowski). Reconsideration of claim 7 is respectfully requested.

7. Applicant respectfully disagrees that the Sendowski reference anticipates Applicant's claim 7. Specifically, Applicant disagrees that Sendowski teaches the step of "(b) automatically

Application No. 10/643,516  
Amendment Dated 02/12/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 08/10/2006  
Page 8 of 11

transferring said designated questionnaire to at least one **loosely networked computer**"

(emphasis added). Pursuant to Applicant's disclosure, a "loosely networked computer" is:

[0048] As noted above, with regard to the present invention, the term "loosely networked" is used to describe a networked computer system wherein devices on the network are tolerant of intermittent network connections. In particular, if any communication connection is available between devices wishing to communicate, network transmissions occur normally, in real time. If a network connection is unavailable, the information is temporarily stored in the device and later transmitted when the connection is restored. Unless otherwise specified, hereinafter the terms "network" or "networked" refer to loosely networked devices.

As described, pursuant to Applicant's disclosure and claim 7, the questionnaire is transmitted automatically to a loosely networked computer wherein if the information may be transmitted in real time or may be stored, or buffered, once a connection is restored.

This recitation from claim 7 is not disclosed by the Sendowski reference. Sendowski discloses a system wherein all are coupled to the Internet. The Sendowski reference does not disclose a loosely networked computer as recited by Applicant's claim 7.

The rejection of claim 7 in the Office action under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is overcome. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 7 is respectfully requested.

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103*

8. Paragraph 8 in the Office action includes a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) that forms the basis for all obvious rejections in the Office action. No response is required from Applicant.

Application No. 10/643,516  
Amendment Dated 02/12/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 08/10/2006  
Page 9 of 11

9. Claims 2-4, 6, and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lew as applied to claim 1, above, and further in view of Sendowski. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-4, 6, and 9-11 is respectfully requested.

10. Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Applicant reincorporates its remarks in relation to claim 1 as set forth above with regard to the Lew reference. In that claim 2 includes all of the limitations of claim 1, claim 2 is allowable at least for the reasons set forth with regard to claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

11. Claim 3 depends from claim 1. Applicant reincorporates its remarks in relation to claim 1 as set forth above with regard to the Lew reference. In that claim 3 includes all of the limitations of claim 1, claim 3 is allowable at least for the reasons set forth with regard to claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

12. Claim 4 depends from claim 1. Applicant reincorporates its remarks in relation to claim 1 as set forth above with regard to the Lew reference. In that claim 4 includes all of the limitations of claim 1, claim 4 is allowable at least for the reasons set forth with regard to claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/643,516  
Amendment Dated 02/12/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 08/10/2006  
Page 10 of 11

13. Claim 6 depends from claim 1. Applicant reincorporates its remarks in relation to claim 1 as set forth above with regard to the Lew reference. In that claim 6 includes all of the limitations of claim 1, claim 6 is allowable at least for the reasons set forth with regard to claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Applicant's claim 9 is amended herein to recite "(a) creating a questionnaire at a first site in a first computer located at a second site, said first site and said second site being connected by a loose network" As asserted above in paragraph 7, incorporated herein by reference, the Sendowski reference does not disclose or teach a loose network as recited in Applicant's disclosure and claim 9. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 9 in the Office action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 9 is respectfully requested.

14. Claim 10 depends from claim 9. Applicant reincorporates its remarks in relation to claim 9 as set forth above with regard to the Sendowski reference. In that claim 10 includes all of the limitations of claim 9, claim 10 is allowable at least for the reasons set forth with regard to claim 9. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 10 is respectfully requested.

15. Claim 11 depends from claim 9. Applicant reincorporates its remarks in relation to claim 9 as set forth above with regard to the Sendowski reference. In that claim 11 includes all of the limitations of claim 9, claim 11 is allowable at least for the reasons set forth with regard to claim 9. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 11 is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/643,516  
Amendment Dated 02/12/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 08/10/2006  
Page 11 of 11

16. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sendowski in view of Joao, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0056374 (hereinafter Joao).

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 8 is respectfully requested.


17. Claim 8 depends from claim 7. Applicant reincorporates its remarks in relation to claim 7 as set forth above in paragraph 7 with regard to the Sendowski reference. In that claim 8 includes all of the limitations of claim 7, claim 8 is allowable at least for the reasons set forth with regard to claim 7. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 8 is respectfully requested.

A petition for an extension of time is submitted herewith. If any additional fee is made payable by the filing of this paper, please consider this our authorization to charge the Deposit Account of the undersigned, No. 06-0540.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 8, 2007

By

  
Scott R. Zingerman, Reg. No. 35,422  
FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP,  
BAILEY & TIPPENS, P.C.  
321 South Boston, Suite 800  
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103-3318  
(918) 599-0621

#401496 v1